

**INITIAL STUDY/  
NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

**Tamien Place  
Residential Development**

**Prepared by the  
City of San José**

**June 2003**

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

I.	INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE .....	1
II.	PROJECT INFORMATION .....	2
III.	DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT.....	3
IV.	ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING & CHECKLIST .....	12
A.	AESTHETICS.....	12
1.	<u>Setting</u> .....	12
2.	<u>Environmental Checklist and Discussion</u> .....	13
3.	<u>Conclusion</u> .....	13
B.	AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.....	14
1.	<u>Setting</u> .....	14
2.	<u>Environmental Checklist and Discussion</u> .....	14
3.	<u>Conclusion</u> .....	14
C.	AIR QUALITY .....	15
1.	<u>Setting</u> .....	15
2.	<u>Environmental Checklist and Discussion</u> .....	15
3.	<u>Conclusion</u> .....	18
D.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES .....	19
1.	<u>Setting</u> .....	19
2.	<u>Environmental Checklist and Discussion</u> .....	19
3.	<u>Conclusion</u> .....	21
E.	CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	22
1.	<u>Setting</u> .....	22
2.	<u>Environmental Checklist and Discussion</u> .....	23
3.	<u>Conclusion</u> .....	25
F.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS.....	26
1.	<u>Setting</u> .....	26
2.	<u>Environmental Checklist and Discussion</u> .....	27
3.	<u>Conclusion</u> .....	28
G.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS .....	29
1.	<u>Setting</u> .....	29
2.	<u>Environmental Checklist and Discussion</u> .....	29
3.	<u>Conclusion</u> .....	31
H.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY .....	32
1.	<u>Setting</u> .....	32
2.	<u>Environmental Checklist and Discussion</u> .....	32
3.	<u>Conclusion</u> .....	35
I.	LAND USE .....	36
1.	<u>Setting</u> .....	36
2.	<u>Environmental Checklist and Discussion</u> .....	36
3.	<u>Conclusion</u> .....	38
J.	MINERAL RESOURCES.....	49
1.	<u>Setting</u> .....	49
2.	<u>Environmental Checklist</u> .....	49
3.	<u>Conclusion</u> .....	49

K.	NOISE .....	50
1.	<u>Setting</u> .....	50
2.	<u>Environmental Checklist and Discussion</u> .....	52
3.	<u>Conclusion</u> .....	57
L.	POPULATION AND HOUSING .....	58
1.	<u>Setting</u> .....	58
2.	<u>Environmental Checklist and Discussion</u> .....	58
3.	<u>Conclusion</u> .....	58
M.	PUBLIC SERVICES .....	59
1.	<u>Setting</u> .....	59
2.	<u>Environmental Checklist and Discussion</u> .....	60
3.	<u>Conclusion</u> .....	61
N.	RECREATION .....	62
1.	<u>Setting</u> .....	62
2.	<u>Environmental Checklist and Discussion</u> .....	62
3.	<u>Conclusion</u> .....	63
O.	TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC .....	64
1.	<u>Setting</u> .....	64
2.	<u>Environmental Checklist and Discussion</u> .....	70
3.	<u>Conclusion</u> .....	74
P.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS .....	75
1.	<u>Setting</u> .....	75
2.	<u>Environmental Checklist and Discussion</u> .....	76
3.	<u>Conclusion</u> .....	77
Q.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE .....	78
V.	REFERENCES .....	80
VI.	AUTHORS AND CONSULTANTS .....	81

## FIGURES

Figure 1:	Regional Map .....	4
Figure 2:	Vicinity Map .....	5
Figure 3:	Aerial Map .....	6
Figure 4:	Proposed Site Plan .....	7
Figure 5:	Proposed Elevations (North and South) .....	8
Figure 6:	Proposed Elevations East and West .....	9
Figure 7:	Proposed Landscape Plan .....	11
Figure 8:	Shadow Analysis – December 21st 9AM .....	39
Figure 9:	Shadow Analysis – December 21st Noon .....	40
Figure 10:	Shadow Analysis – December 21st 4PM .....	41
Figure 11:	Shadow Analysis – June 21st 9AM .....	42
Figure 12:	Shadow Analysis – June 21st Noon .....	43
Figure 13:	Shadow Analysis – June 21st 4PM .....	44
Figure 14:	Shadow Analysis – March/September 21st 9AM .....	45
Figure 15:	Shadow Analysis – March/September 21st Noon .....	46
Figure 16:	Shadow Analysis – March/September 21st 4PM .....	47
Figure 17:	Combined Shadow Analysis – December 21 <sup>st</sup> .....	48

## TABLES

Table 1: Measured Maximum Noise Levels at Approximate Building Setback.....	51
Table 2: Measured and Estimated Outdoor Vibration Levels.....	52
Table 3: Estimated Maximum Noise Levels and Approximate Façade Sound Insulation Ratings ....	54
Table 4: Estimated Indoor Vibration Levels at First Residential Tower Levels.....	55
Table 5: Signalized Intersection Level of Service Definitions.....	67
Table 6: Level of Service Criteria for Unsignalized Intersections.....	67
Table 7: Density-Based Freeway Level of Service Criteria.....	68
Table 8: Existing Intersection Levels of Service .....	68
Table 9: Background Intersection Levels of Service .....	69
Table 10: Project Trip Generation Rates and Estimates.....	71
Table 11: Background and Project Intersection Levels of Service .....	72
Table 12: Project Freeway Segment Capacity Analysis .....	73

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	Tree Survey
APPENDIX B	Historic Structure Evaluation
APPENDIX C	Geotechnical Report
APPENDIX D	Hazardous Materials Report
APPENDIX E	Noise and Vibration Analysis
APPENDIX F	Transportation Impact Analysis

## **I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE**

---

This Initial Study of environmental impacts is being prepared to conform to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations §15000 et.seq.).

This Initial Study evaluates the potential environmental impacts that might reasonably be anticipated as result of the implementation of the proposed Planned Development (PD) zoning of 260-multi-family residential units on an approximately 3.2 acre project site.

## **II. PROJECT INFORMATION**

---

### **A. PROJECT TITLE**

Tamien Place Residential Development

### **B. PROJECT LOCATION**

The proposed project site is located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Lick and Alma Avenues in the City of San José.

### **C. LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS**

City of San José  
Department of Building, Planning, and Code Enforcement  
801 North First Street, Room 400  
San José, CA 95110

### **D. CONTACT PERSONS AND TELEPHONE NUMBER**

Anastazia Aziz, Planner II, 277-4576

### **E. PROPERTY OWNER'S NAME AND ADDRESS**

Barry Swenson Builder  
777 North First Street, 5th Floor  
San José, CA 95112

### **F. ZONING DISTRICT AND GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION**

Zoning: Light Industrial

General Plan Designation: Transit Corridor Residential

Specific Plan Designation: Transit Corridor Residential

### **III. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT**

---

#### **A. OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT**

The project proposes the redevelopment of a 3.20 acre site which will replace the existing Alma Bowl bowling alley, Sprig Electric's office/industrial building, and associated parking lots at the northwest corner of Lick Avenue and Alma Avenue in the City of San José. The proposed PD zoning could allow the development of up to 260 dwelling units. The currently proposed conceptual site plan is for two eleven-story condominium buildings that contain a total of 228 condominium units, and two three-story townhouse buildings that contain 14 townhouse units. This Initial Study analyzes the environmental impacts that would result from the physical configuration shown on the current site plan, and the traffic and air quality impacts that would result from the maximum number of units allowed by the proposed PD zoning.

#### **B. PROJECT INFORMATION**

##### **1. Project Location and Existing Uses**

The approximately 3.20 acre project site is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Lick and Alma Avenues in the City of San José, as shown on Figures 1 and 2. The project site currently contains the Alma Bowl bowling alley, an office/industrial building and associated surface parking lots. An aerial of the project site and surrounding area is shown on Figure 3.

##### **2. Project Description**

The project proposes the demolition of the existing Alma Bowl bowling alley structure, the office/industrial building and associated surface parking lots, and the rezoning of the project site to allow the development of up to 260 multi-family residential units. The proposed project includes the construction of both townhouse and condominium residential units on the project site. The proposed PD zoning would allow the development of up to 260 multi-family residential units; however, the proposed site plan includes 228 condominium and 14 townhouse units. The proposed site plan is shown on Figure 4.

The project design includes a podium over below grade parking. The residential structure will be on top of the podium, which will also contain some parking, landscaping, and outdoor recreation facilities. The podium structure will cover 116, 727 square feet, or 84% of the site. Based upon the conceptual site plan, the proposed density would be 76 dwelling units per acre; based upon the maximum allowed units (260), the density could be as high as 81 units per acre.

#### **Proposed Townhouse Units**

The conceptual site plan proposes the construction of up to 14 townhouse residential units in two adjacent buildings along Lick Avenue. The town house structures may be as tall as 45 feet to the peak of the roof, and will contain three stories. Each townhouse would include three bedrooms. Access to the townhouses will be provided from a front yard on Lick Avenue, and through a two car garage located in the rear of the unit. The northernmost and southernmost townhouses will also have balconies on their north and south facing facades, respectively (as shown on Figure 5).

### **Proposed Condominium Units**

The project proposes the construction of two, eleven story, condominium buildings. Each building would be a maximum of 120 feet in height measured from the existing elevation of Lick Avenue. One building would be located along the north property boundary and the other building located along the south property boundary of the project site, as represented on Figure 4. Each building could contain as many as 130 condominium units including one-, two- and three-bedroom units. Each unit would include a balcony, as shown on Figure 6.

### **Proposed Parking**

A total of 392 off-street parking spaces for cars would be provided by the project, including the parking provided by the two-car garages attached to each townhouse (28 spaces). The project proposes the construction of one level of below grade parking across the entire project site. The below grade parking would provide a total of 340 parking spaces. The remaining 24 parking spaces would be located on top of the podium, between the proposed townhouse and condominium buildings. Access to all on-site parking spaces for cars would be provided from one driveway located on Lick Avenue. In addition to the parking spaces provided for cars, 52 motorcycle and 62 bicycle parking spaces would be provided as part of the proposed project, based on the conceptual program.

### **Proposed Landscaping**

The project proposes perimeter landscaping along both street frontages, ranging between 21 and 28 feet wide adjacent to Alma Avenue and 12 feet wide along Lick Avenue. The conceptual landscape plan shows turf areas, a pool, and other recreational amenities, as well as a trellis and decorative landscaping on top of the podium (refer to Figure 7). In addition, the project would plant street trees adjacent to the sidewalks along Lick and Alma Avenues.

### **Water Main**

The proposed project includes the installation of an approximately 2,440-foot, 16-inch, water main within the public right-of-way of Lick Avenue between Willow Street and Alma Avenue. The proposed water main will connect to the existing water mains in Willow Street and Alma Avenue and will provide a fire flow of at least 4,500 gallons per minute (GPM). Installation of the water main will take approximately two weeks, during which time through traffic on Lick Avenue will be limited to one lane in the area of construction.



## **IV. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING & CHECKLIST**

---

This section will describe the existing environmental conditions on and near the subject site as well as environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. The environmental checklist as recommended in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines was used to identify environmental impacts that could occur if the proposed project is implemented. The right-hand column in the checklist lists the source(s) for the answer to each question. The sources cited are identified at the end of the checklist. This section will clearly identify all potential environmental impacts from the project, including an explanation for those issues determined to be less than significant. Mitigation measures are identified and described for all potentially significant impacts, and evaluated briefly for the expected effectiveness/feasibility of these measures, where necessary.

### **A. AESTHETICS**

#### **1. Setting**

##### **Visual and Aesthetic Character**

The project is proposed on a 3.2-acre project site that is currently developed with the Alma Bowl bowling alley, Sprig Electric's office/industrial building, and associated parking lots at the northwest corner of Lick and Alma Avenues. The vacant Alma Bowl building on the project site is a one-story, flat-roofed building constructed of painted cinder block. The bowling alley building includes areas for bowling, a lounge, a restaurant, a pro shop, an office and restrooms. In addition to the building, a large sign which says, "ALMA BOWL" and smaller associated signs for the restaurant, pizza and cocktails are located at the southeast corner of the project site.

The Sprig Electric office building is located along the northern property boundary. The building is a single story, flat roofed office building. The interior space includes an office area, a kitchen and restrooms.

The project site is almost entirely covered by buildings or asphalt parking lots. There are 27 trees on or surrounding the perimeter of the project site. No other significant landscaping remains on the project site.

The project site is surrounded by multi-story multi-family residential structures, an elevated rail line, and an elevated transit station complex that includes a day care center and a parking lot.

## 2. Environmental Checklist and Discussion

AESTHETICS						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project:						
1) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
2) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
3) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
4) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1

**Discussion:** As proposed, the project would change the appearance of the site from a large parking lot containing a commercial building and an office industrial structure, to a new high-density residential development. The appearance of the property would be changed from low intensity single-story structures to a view of two three-story townhouse buildings and two 120-foot condominium towers. As proposed, the project would provide perimeter landscaping that includes trees, shrubs, lawn, and flowering plants, as shown on Figure 7. Although the views of the project site would substantially change with implementation of the proposed project, the introduction of a new high-density residential development within this highly urbanized setting would not result in a significant adverse aesthetic impact.

The proposed project would introduce substantial additional sources of light to the project area, including two 120-foot tall residential buildings with windows that would be lit up at night. Exterior security lighting would be designed to direct light downward, and to minimize spillover onto adjacent properties. While lighted windows will be visible at night, they would not create a substantial source or change in ambient light levels in this highly urbanized area. Although the proposed project would introduce additional lighting sources within the project area, the addition of this light would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the project area.

## 3. Conclusion

The proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

## B. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

### 1. Setting

The project site is currently developed and not used for agricultural purposes. The site is not designated by the California Resources Agency as Farmland of any type, and is not the subject of a Williamson Act contract. There is no property used for agricultural purposes adjacent to the project site.

### 2. Environmental Checklist and Discussion

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project:						
1) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3
2) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4
3) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1

**Discussion:** The proposed project will have no impact on agricultural activities.

### 3. Conclusion

The project will have no adverse impact on agricultural land or agricultural activities.

## C. AIR QUALITY

### 1. Setting

Air quality and the amount of a given pollutant in the atmosphere are determined by the amount of pollutant released and the atmosphere's ability to transport and dilute the pollutant. The major determinants of transport and dilution are wind, atmospheric stability, terrain and for photochemical pollutants, sunshine.

The Bay Area typically has moderate ventilation, frequent inversions that restrict vertical dilution and terrain that restricts horizontal dilution. These factors give the Bay Area a relatively high atmospheric potential for pollution.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) monitors air quality at several locations within the San Francisco Bay Air Basin. The closest monitoring stations to the project site are in downtown San Jose and Los Gatos. Records since 1993 indicate that ozone levels have exceeded State and Federal standards and PM10 levels have exceeded the State standard. Violations of the carbon monoxide standards were recorded prior to 1992.

Of the three pollutants known to at times exceed the State and/or Federal standards in the project area, two are regional pollutants. Both ozone and PM10 are considered regional pollutant in that concentrations are not determined by proximity to individual sources, but show a relative uniformity over a region. The third pollutant, carbon monoxide, is considered a local pollutant because elevated concentrations are usually only found near the source.

The Federal Clean Air Act and the California Clean Act of 1988 require that the State Air Resources Board, based on air quality monitoring data, designate portions of the state where the federal or state ambient air quality standard are not met as "nonattainment area". Because of the differences between the federal and state standards, the designation of nonattainment areas is different under the federal and state legislation. Under the California Clean Air Act, Santa Clara County is a nonattainment area for ozone and PM10.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District defines sensitive receptors as facilities where sensitive receptor population groups (children, the elderly, the acutely ill and the chronically ill) are likely to reside. These land uses include residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, retirement homes, convalescent homes, hospitals and medical clinics. The adjacent child care center located to the north of the project site is the closest sensitive receptor to the proposed project.

### 2. Environmental Checklist and Discussion

AIR QUALITY						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project:						
1) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,5

AIR QUALITY						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project:						
2) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
3) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is classified as non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
4) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,5
5) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,5

**Discussion:** The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has established thresholds for what could be considered a significant impact on existing air quality. A project that generates more than 80 pounds per day of reactive organic gases (ROG) will have a significant impact on regional air quality, according to BAAQMD guidelines. The District generally does not consider that a project generating less than 2,000 vehicle trips per day is likely to exceed their adopted thresholds of significance, and does not recommend preparation of a detailed air quality analysis<sup>1</sup>. The traffic report prepared for the proposed project estimated that the proposed project could generate approximately 1,774 new vehicle trips per day. The proposed project will not result in a significant air quality impact, based on BAAQMD criteria.

### Construction-Related Impacts

Construction activities during the proposed redevelopment of the project site, including the installation of the 16-inch water main in Lick Avenue, will generate exhaust emissions and fugitive dust that will affect local and regional air quality, as a result of demolition, excavation, recycling of concrete and pavement, construction vehicle traffic, and wind blowing over exposed earth. Construction activities are also a source of organic gas emissions. Solvents in adhesives, non-waterbase paints, thinners, and other construction materials will evaporate into the atmosphere and will participate in the photochemical reaction that creates urban ozone. Asphalt used in paving is also a source of organic gases for a short time after its application.

<sup>1</sup> BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, December 1999.

Construction dust could affect local air quality at various times during construction of the project. The dry, windy climate of the area during the summer months creates a high potential for dust generation when and if underlying soils are exposed to the atmosphere.

The effects of construction activities, especially the substantial excavation required for this project, will be increased dustfall and locally elevated levels of PM10 downwind of construction activity. Construction dust has the potential for creating a nuisance at nearby properties and will impact adjacent sensitive receptors, including residents and the children at the adjacent day care center.

**Impact:** During construction, the proposed project could result in significant short-term air quality impacts associated with dust generation.

**Mitigation and Avoidance:** The BAAQMD has prepared a list of feasible construction dust control measures that can reduce construction impacts to a level that is less than significant. The following construction practices will be implemented during all phases of construction on the project site:

- Use dust-proof chutes for loading construction debris onto trucks.
- Water to control dust generation during demolition of structures and break-up of pavement.
- Cover all trucks hauling demolition debris from the site.
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- Sweep daily (preferably with water sweepers) all paved access road, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
- Sweep streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.
- Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).
- Install erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.
- Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
- If concrete or pavement is recycled on-site, misters and/or other water sources will be used to avoid generation of visible dust plumes.
- If the project proposes to recycle demolition debris, an air quality plan will be submitted to the Director of Planning. The plan will describe the methods used to avoid visible dust generation during the crushing, movement, and storage of recycled material.

### **3. Conclusion**

The proposed project will not result in significant local or regional air quality impacts. Short-term air quality impacts associated with construction of the proposed project, including the installation of the water main in Lick Avenue will be reduced to less than significant levels with the inclusion of proposed mitigation measures.

## D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

### 1. Setting

A field reconnaissance survey of the project site was conducted on January 31, 2003 by *David J. Powers and Associates*. All of the project site is urban in nature and includes paved surfaces, buildings, and ornamental landscaping. The vegetation on the project site provides marginal habitat for animal species adapted to human encroachment such as scrub jays, robins, and tree squirrels.

#### Mature Trees

The City of San José Tree Ordinance defines an ordinance size tree as “any woody perennial plant characterized by having a main stem or trunk which measures 56 inches or more in circumference (18 inches in diameter) at a height of 24 inches above natural grade slope”. A tree survey of the 27 trees located on the project site was conducted by *David J. Powers and Associates* on January 31, 2003 and is included as Appendix A of this Initial Study. There are three ordinance size street tree along the project’s frontage on Lick Avenue (refer to Appendix A). All three of the ordinance size trees are London Plane and have been topped to avoid contact with overhead wires.

### 2. Environmental Checklist and Discussion

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project:						
1) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
2) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2



BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project:						
3) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
4) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
5) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
6) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1

**Discussion:** The project site and surrounding area is completely developed and, as a result, has low value in terms of biological habitat. The site is flat and does not contain any depressions, undulations or water features which could be conducive to the establishment of wetland habitat. There are no streams, creeks, or waterways on or adjacent to the project site. Developed habitat is common in the Bay Area, and the project site does not provide habitat for any special status species. Therefore, project impacts to the developed habitat on the site will not be significant.

Rare, threatened, endangered and sensitive plants, animals and natural communities are not expected or likely to occur on the project site. This conclusion is based upon the fact that the site does not contain suitable habitat for any of these species and none of these species were observed during field visits.

### Ordinance Size Trees

The proposed project will result in the loss of 22 trees. At least one ordinance size street tree will be removed by the proposed project. The removal of an ordinance size tree is a significant impact.

**Impact:** The proposed project will result in the removal of at least one ordinance size street tree.

**Mitigation and Avoidance:** The following mitigation measure is proposed by the project to reduce the loss of ordinance size street trees to a less than significant level:

- To the extent feasible, existing healthy and mature trees will be incorporated into the project landscaping.
- Each ordinance-size tree removed by the proposed project will be replaced by four 24-inch box trees. Replacement trees may be street trees within the public right-of-way.

### **3. Conclusion**

Implementation of the proposed project, with the mitigation measures described above, will not result in significant impacts to biological resources.

## **E. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

The following discussion is based upon an Archaeological Survey completed by *Holman and Associates, Consulting Archaeologists* for the project site in March 2003 and a Historical Structure Evaluation completed by *Archaeological Resource Management* for the project site in June 10, 2003. The Historical Structure Evaluation is provided as Appendix B of this Initial Study.

### **1. Setting**

#### **Archaeological Resources**

Archaeological research of the project site was initiated with a search of relevant records, maps, and archives maintained by the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at Sonoma State University and surface reconnaissance of the project site. Archival research indicated the nearby presence of a significant prehistoric archaeological site known to contain human remains, and that the Guadalupe River corridor vicinity is archaeologically sensitive for buried prehistoric sites. There are no records of archaeological surveys conducted on the project site and surface reconnaissance did not reveal any additional information because the project site is almost completely paved.

A significant prehistoric archaeological site is located about 490 feet north of the project site in and around the Valley Transit Authority's Tamien Station. This site was extensively researched during the construction of the Tamien Station. Approximately 125 prehistoric Native American burials and a large, elaborate assemblage of prehistoric artifacts and archaeological data were recovered. This site was found under approximately 20 inches of recent river-deposited silts and had a maximum thickness of 60 inches.

Due to the presence of the nearby archaeological site, subsurface testing for archaeological resources was conducted on the project site. Ten backhoe trenches were excavated on the project site. The trenches revealed a rather consistent soil profile under disturbed and filled near-surface layers. Visual inspection of the trenches and excavated soil, and screening of samples of the excavated soil discovered discontinuous scant evidence of possible archaeological resources on the project site. No human remains were found on the site. Based on subsurface testing, the consulting archaeologist concluded that it is unlikely that significant archaeological resources are located on the project site and no additional archaeological testing was conducted.

#### **Historic Structures**

An historical evaluation of the Alma Bowl building was conducted in April 2001. The research focused on the characteristics of the structure and its contribution to the historic fabric of the City of San Jose and the County of Santa Clara. The existing structure is a single-story building constructed of cinder block and wooden framework and was built in 1959. The structure is not currently listed on the California Register of Historic Places (CRHR) or the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Due to the existing structure's lack of artistic merit, distinctive characteristics or quality workmanship, and association with any significant events or people in the City of San Jose, State of California, and the United States of America, the existing structure is not eligible for listing in the San Jose Historic Resource Inventory, the California Register of Historic Resources, or the National Register of Historic Places.

## 2. Environmental Checklist and Discussion

CULTURAL RESOURCES						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,13
1) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	11,12
2) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
3) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	11,12
4) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

**Discussion:** The project proposes to construct a below grade parking garage across the entire site and to install a water main within the public right-of-way of Lick Avenue between Willow Street and Alma Avenue. While no archaeological resources were found during subsurface testing on the project site, the consulting archaeologist could not state that there is no potential that archaeological resources may be discovered on the project site during excavation for the proposed below grade parking garage. Destruction of a significant archaeological site or of human remains would be a significant impact.

The existing structures on the project site are not listed and are not eligible for listing in the San Jose Historic Resource Inventory, the California Register of Historic Resources, or the National Register of Historic Places. Therefore, the proposed project will not impact a historical resource.

**Impact:** The proposed project may impact buried archaeological resources during excavation for the below grade parking garage and installation of the water main.

**Mitigation and Avoidance:** The following mitigation is included in the project to reduce potential impacts to buried archaeological resources to a less than significant level. If resources are discovered during construction of the proposed project, the mitigation will be completely reported in a comprehensive manner, incorporating all methods used and data gained, thorough contemporary scientific analysis of all data, and interpretation of any archaeological resources within a regional archaeological framework. Qualified professional archaeologists will complete the report to best contemporary standards, and the data will be made available to other qualified researchers following completion of the Final Report, and a copy will be provided to the Director of Planning of the City of San Jose. Appropriate specialized, focused scientific analytic techniques will be applied (e.g., radiocarbon dating,

obsidian sourcing and hydration, typological studies, geomorphological studies, faunal analysis, historic research, etc.).

- Archaeological monitoring for the proposed project will be conducted under a written Archaeological Monitoring Agreement as described below:
  - timely notification prior to any excavations;
  - monitoring during earth-moving or soil disturbing activities until and unless the monitor determines that no impacts to potentially significant archaeological materials will occur;
  - specific requirements that archaeological monitors be notified immediately if potentially significant archaeological resources are encountered outside the specified monitoring zones or anywhere in the absence of an on-site monitor;
  - authority of the on-site archaeological monitor to halt and/or relocate excavations if potentially significant archaeological materials or human remains are encountered;
  - time and space to record, photograph and map, recover, retrieve, and/or remove any archaeological materials and data during the construction process;
  - time and funding for laboratory cleaning, cataloging, analysis, and preparation for permanent curation of any and all recovered data and materials after on-site monitoring ends;
  - time and funding for a Final Report of findings, to incorporate data developed for this report as appropriate and data developed by monitoring and analysis; additional historical and/or archival research may also be warranted. Copies of the Final Report will be submitted to the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System for inclusion in the permanent archives, and another copy should accompany any curated archaeological materials and data. Archaeological data and recovered materials are and will remain the property of the property owners.
- Since this project will take place in an archaeologically sensitive area, the construction team will be prepared to respond appropriately if archaeological resources are discovered. Archaeological resources and human remains are protected from inadvertent adverse effects under CEQA, and supervisory and construction personnel will, therefore, be made aware of the possibility of encountering archaeological materials in this sensitive zone. In the project area, the most common and recognizable evidence of prehistoric archaeological resources are deposits of charcoal and burnt rocks and earth, Bay and marine shell, usually in fragments (mussels, oysters, clams, abalone, crabs, etc.), and/or faunal bone (deer, marine mammals, birds, etc.), usually in a dark fine-grained soil (midden); stone flakes left from manufacturing stone tools, or the tools themselves (mortars, pestles, arrowheads and spear points), and human burials, often as dislocated bones. Historic materials older than 50 years—bottles, artifacts, trash dumps, features such as roadways or wharves, structural remains, etc.—may also have scientific and cultural significance.

- If during the construction of the proposed project any evidence of archaeological resources is uncovered or encountered, all excavations within 10 meters/30 feet will be halted long enough to call in the monitoring archaeologists to assess the situation and propose appropriate measures. In general, any caches of artifacts, structural remains, trash pits, etc., will be assessed on-site by an archaeologist.
- In the event that human remains are encountered during construction, whether historic or prehistoric, the project will be prepared to carry out the requirements of California State law with regards to such discoveries (i.e., beginning with notification of the County Coroner). Consultation with appropriate Native American representatives designated by the California Native American Heritage Commission will be conducted if Native American remains are found.
- To set up and facilitate both the recommended area-specific monitoring and the response procedure required under CEQA, a pre-construction meeting will be arranged involving responsible project personnel, both on-site supervisory construction personnel, and the archaeological monitors. The purpose of this meeting will be to make familiar all involved parties with basic identification of archaeological deposits and features and with the provisions of this plan. Construction contractors should be prepared to halt and/or relocate work while finds are identified, recorded, evaluated, and if warranted, mitigation carried out. In virtually all reasonably foreseeable circumstances, the appropriate mitigation action will be recording and removal of archaeological data from the project excavation area.

### **3. Conclusion**

Implementation of the proposed project, with inclusion of the above mitigation measures, will not result in significant impacts to cultural resources.

## **F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

The following discussion is based upon a preliminary geotechnical investigation completed by *Lowney Associates* on April 11, 2001. The report is included as Appendix C of this Initial Study.

### **1. Setting**

The project site is located on a valley floor at an elevation of approximately 112 feet above sea level. Due to the flatness of the site, the potential for landslide and erosion is low. The entire project site is underlain by stiff to very stiff silty clay soil with a moderate plasticity to a depth of 350 to 400 feet. The upper layer of soil on the site is highly expansive.

The project is located in a seismically active region. There are no known faults or Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zones close to the project site, and therefore primary ground rupture on the site is unlikely. The site, however, will be subject to severe ground shaking.

The closest active faults to the project site are the Monte Vista-Shannon, Hayward, Calaveras, and San Andreas. The Monte Vista-Shannon, Hayward and Calaveras faults are located approximately 6.25 miles southwest of the project site, 9.0 miles northeast of the project site, and 10 miles northeast of the project site, respectively. The San Andreas is located approximately 11.25 miles southwest of the project site.

Liquefaction is seismic hazard in which soils are temporarily transformed into a liquid state during the stress of an earthquake. The potential for liquefaction on the site is low.

During borings conducted on the project site during the geotechnical investigation encountered groundwater at depths of approximately 11.25 feet below the ground surface.

## 2. Environmental Checklist and Discussion

GEOLOGY AND SOILS						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project:						
1) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:						
a) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as described on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6
b) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6
c) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6
d) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,6
2) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,6
3) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6
4) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6
5) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1

**Discussion:** Although the project site is not on or near an earthquake fault, it is within the seismically active San Francisco Bay Area and moderate to severe ground shaking is probable during the useful life of the proposed buildings. Therefore, the proposed project may expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, as the result of a seismic event in the project area. This is a significant impact.



Due to the high expansion potential of the soil on-site, structures and other improvements may be damaged by the shrink/swell behavior of the soil. This is a significant impact.

**Impact:** The proposed project may expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, as the result of a geologic and soil conditions associated with the project site.

**Mitigation and Avoidance:** The following measures are included in the project to reduce potential geology and soil impacts to a less than significant level:

- The proposed project will be designed and built in conformance with a design-level geotechnical investigation prepared specifically for the project and subject to review and approval by the City Geologist; and
- The proposed project will be designed and built in conformance with the requirements of the Uniform Building Code for Seismic Zone 4.

### **3. Conclusion**

Implementation of the proposed project, with inclusion of the above mitigation measures, will not result in significant geology and soils impacts.

## G. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The following discussion is based upon a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment completed by *RRM Engineering Contracting Firm*, on August 12, 2002. The report is included as Appendix D of this Initial Study.

### 1. Setting

The existing buildings on the project site were both constructed prior to 1978; therefore, there is the potential for asbestos and lead based paint to be present in both the Alma Bowl and Sprig Electric buildings. Both buildings were constructed in approximately 1960. In addition, the Alma Bowl building is recorded as a previous asbestos removal site.

#### Leaking Underground Storage Tank

Two gasoline underground storage tanks (UST) and one diesel UST were reported on the project site. The tanks and all associated piping were removed from the project site in March 1993. All of the identified contaminated soil has been removed from the project site, and the case was issued a Closure Letter from the Santa Clara Valley Water District on September 15, 1994. Therefore, no further action is required and the case is closed.

### 2. Environmental Checklist and Discussion

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project:						
1) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
2) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,
3) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
4) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,12

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project:						
5) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,7
6) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,7
7) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
8) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1

**Discussion:** The project site is not located within the Santa Clara County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) jurisdiction, nor is it designated one of the City's evacuation routes. The project area is not subject to wildfires.

As the result of the excavation and removal of the USTs, the contaminated soil and the associated issuance of a Closure Letter by the Water District for the USTs on the project site, the implementation of the proposed project would not result in the exposure of people residing at the proposed project to hazardous materials.

However, since the existing buildings on the project site were constructed prior to 1978 and the one building has been the subject of the removal of asbestos containing materials, the existing buildings are likely to contain asbestos and likely to contain lead-based paint.

**Impact:** The existing Alma Bowl and Sprig Electric buildings could contain asbestos and/or lead-based paint containing materials. Demolition of these structures could expose construction workers or other persons in the vicinity to harmful levels of asbestos or lead.

**Mitigation and Avoidance:** Conformance with the following regulatory programs will reduce health risks associated with friable asbestos and lead paint to a less than significant level:

- Asbestos surveys will be conducted for the two buildings, as required under National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) guidelines. In addition, NESHAP guidelines require that all potentially friable asbestos containing materials be removed prior to activities that may disturb the materials.
- As appropriate, a lead survey of painted surfaces and soil around buildings built prior to 1978 will be performed prior to demolition. Requirements in the California Code of Regulations will be followed during demolition activities, including employee training, employee air monitoring and dust control. Any debris or soil containing lead-based paint or coatings will be disposed of at landfills that meet acceptance criteria for the waste being disposed.

### **3. Conclusion**

The proposed project, with implementation of the above mitigation measures, will not result in significant hazardous material impacts.

## H. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

### 1. Setting

Almost the entire project site is covered with impervious surfaces, including buildings and surface parking, except approximately 2,100 square feet along Alma Avenue and the small amount of landscaping adjacent to the existing buildings. Runoff from the site is collected and conveyed to the City's stormwater system.

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Flood Insurance Rate Maps, the project site is located within two flood zones, Zone D and Zone AH<sup>2</sup>. Most of the project site is in Zone D. Although not within the 100-year floodplain, areas designated as Zone D may be subject to undetermined but possible flood hazards.

The undeveloped portion of the project site directly adjacent to Alma Avenue, an approximate ten-foot strip, is within the 100-year floodplain and is designated as Zone AH with flooding up to an elevation of 114 feet.

### 2. Environmental Checklist and Discussion

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project:						
1) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
2) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
3) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1

<sup>2</sup> National Flood Insurance Program, Flood Insurance Rate Map, Community Panel Number 060349 0031 D, August 2, 1982.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project:						
4) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
5) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
6) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
7) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,8, 15
8) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8,15
9) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
10) Be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2

**Discussion:** Impervious areas on the project site will not increase as a result of the proposed project. The currently undeveloped area along Alma Avenue will be landscaped and will remain permeable. Landscaping is also proposed along the Lick Avenue frontage, in a strip approximately 12 feet wide.

### Drainage

The proposed project site is currently developed. Runoff from the site will continue to be collected and conveyed to the City's stormwater system. The proposed project will not increase runoff and the project will not change the existing drainage patterns in the area; therefore, the proposed project will not have a substantial impact on the existing drainage system.

## **Flood Hazards**

The proposed project does not include any development within the identified 100-year floodplain, which encroaches approximately 10 feet onto the project site along Alma Avenue. The proposed podium structure will be set back at least 21 feet from Alma Avenue. The portion of the project site along Alma Avenue, including the area within the floodplain will be landscaped and will remain undeveloped.

The site is not subject to seiche or tsunami.

## **Water Quality**

Due to increases in vehicle use and human activity, the amount of pollution carried by runoff from the proposed project will increase.

In addition to erosion and sedimentation, construction-related activities associated with the proposed building demolition and construction, such as the storage of materials and the cleaning of equipment, could also result in stormwater pollution.

The City of San José has been issued a Municipal Permit under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System program which covers implementing Best Management Practices during construction and post-construction periods. Implementation of effective post construction Best Management Practices on the site could result in an incremental improvement of water quality presently being discharged from the site over time.

**Impact:** Implementation of the proposed project could result in increased stormwater pollution, particularly during construction.

**Mitigation and Avoidance:** The following mitigation measures will reduce water quality impacts to a less than significant level:

- The project will comply with the City of San José Grading Ordinance, including erosion- and dust-control during site preparation and with the City of San José zoning ordinance requirement for keeping adjacent streets free of dirt and mud during construction. The following specific measures will be implemented to prevent storm water pollution and minimize potential sedimentation during construction.
  - restricting grading to the dry season or meeting City requirements for grading during the rainy season;
  - using Best Management Practices to retain sediment on the project site;
  - providing temporary cover of disturbed surfaces to help control erosion during construction; and
  - providing permanent cover to stabilize the disturbed surfaces after construction has been completed.
- The project will comply with the NPDES General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit administered by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Prior to construction grading for the proposed land uses, the applicant will file a “Notice of

Intent” (NOI) to comply with the General Permit and prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which addresses measures that will be included in the project to minimize and control construction and post-construction runoff. The following measures will be included in the SWPPP:

- Preclude non-storm water discharges to the storm water system.
- Effective, site-specific Best Management Practices for erosion and sediment control during the construction and post-construction periods.
- Coverage of soil, equipment, and supplies that could contribute non-visible pollution prior to rainfall events or perform monitoring of runoff.
- Monitoring of discharges to the storm water system.

The project will submit a copy of the draft SWPPP to the City of San José Department of Environmental Services for review and approval prior to construction of the project. The certified SWPPP will be posted at the project site and will be updated to reflect current site conditions.

When the construction phase is complete, a Notice of Termination (NOT) for the General Permit for Construction will be filed with the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the City of San José Department of Environmental Services. The NOT will document that all elements of the SWPPP have been executed, construction materials and waste have been properly disposed of, and a post-construction storm water management plan is in place as described in the SWPPP for the site.

- As part of the mitigation for post-construction runoff impacts addressed in the SWPPP, the project will implement regular maintenance activities (i.e., sweeping, maintaining vegetative swales, cleaning storm water inlet filters, litter control) at the site to prevent soil, grease, and litter from accumulating on the project site and contaminating surface runoff. Storm water catch basins will be stenciled to discourage illegal dumping.

### **3. Conclusion**

The proposed project, with implementation of the mitigation measures above, will not result in substantial pollution of water discharged to the existing storm water collection systems, and will have no significant impacts on flooding, or on the capacity of the storm water collection system.



## I. LAND USE

### 1. Setting

#### Existing Land Uses

The 3.2-acre project site is currently developed with the closed Alma Bowl bowling alley, an office/industrial building, and associated parking lots. Sprig Electric currently occupies the office building located along the northern property boundary.

Most of the project site is covered by buildings or an asphalt parking lot; there are 27 trees on the project site. No other significant landscaping remains on the project site.

#### Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is located at the intersection of Lick and Alma Avenues in the City of San Jose. The project site is surrounded by existing urban development, including a child care center to the north, multi-family residential land uses to the east across Lick Avenue and to the south across Alma Avenue, and the Southern Pacific Railway lines and State Highway 87 to the west. The outdoor play area at the child day care center is currently shaded by existing trees and the child day care building itself. An aerial photo of the project site and the surrounding land uses is shown on Figure 3.

#### Existing Zoning and General Plan Land Use Designation

The zoning for the project site is Light Industrial (LI). The site is within the boundary of the Tamien Station Area Specific Plan. The General Plan and Specific Plan land use designation for the site is *Transit Corridor Residential*.

### 2. Environmental Checklist and Discussion

LAND USE						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project:						
1) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
2) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,4,16
3) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1

**Discussion:** The project proposes the construction of two 120-foot, 11-story condominium residential towers and two 45-foot, three-story townhouse buildings. The existing multi-family residential buildings to the east and the south of the project site are approximately two stories in height. The proposed townhouse buildings would provide a gradual change in scale between the existing multi-family residential buildings across Lick Avenue and the proposed condominium towers. The multi-family residences to the south of the site are approximately 80 feet away across Alma Avenue.

The proposed buildings will be set back from the railway lines and will incorporate design features to avoid noise or vibration impacts from the adjacent railroad use, as described in **Section IV., K., Noise**, of this report.

The project proposes that the 120-foot condominium tower and a 45-foot townhouse building along the northern site boundary will be approximately 40 to 50 feet south from the existing child care center and associated surface parking lot to the north.

To determine if the proposed building would result in a shadow impact on the adjacent sensitive land uses, a child care center to the north and multi-family residential buildings to the east, a shade/shadow analysis was conducted for the proposed project. The shadow impact analysis presented here is for three different times of the year; December 21, June 21, and March and September 21. Since the solar conditions on the latter two dates (the spring and fall equinoxes) are identical, they are considered together as an intermediate between the two extremes. Maximum shading occurs on December 21, when the sun is at its lowest angle above the horizon. Minimum shading occurs on June 21, when the sun is highest above the horizon. Since most of solar energy is received between 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., this period of the day is evaluated in the following shadow analysis.

The positions of the shadows that will be cast on December 21 at 9:00 a.m., noon, and 4:00 p.m. are shown on Figures 8, 9, and 10. At 9:00 a.m., shadows are cast in a northwesterly direction. The shadows from the proposed condominium towers will shade the western 50 percent of the child care center, and the shadows from the proposed townhouse buildings will shade the southeast corner of the child care center's outdoor play area, as shown on Figure 8. By noon, shadows are cast in the northerly direction. At noon, the shadow from the northern most condominium tower extends off the project site shading 50 percent of the southerly portion of the child care center (building and outdoor play area), as shown on Figure 9. At 4:00 p.m., shadows are cast in the northeasterly direction. The shadows from the proposed townhouse and condominium buildings extend across Lick Avenue shading the multi-family residential buildings frontage on Lick Avenue, as shown on Figure 10.

The positions of the shadows that will be cast on June 21 at 9:00 a.m., noon, and 4:00 p.m. are shown on Figures 11, 12, and 13. As shown on Figures 11 through 13, the shadows cast from the proposed buildings either remain on site or shade adjacent roadways and parking areas. Shadows from the proposed buildings during this time of the year will not impact adjacent sensitive land uses.

The positions of the shadows that will be cast on March/September 21 at 9:00 a.m., noon, and 4:00 p.m. are shown on Figures 14, 15, and 16. At 9:00 a.m., shadows from the proposed buildings are cast in a northwesterly direction and will only shade a small portion of the child care center, as shown on Figure 14. By noon, shadows from the proposed buildings are cast in the northerly direction and do not shade any adjacent sensitive land uses, as shown on Figure 15. At 4:00 p.m., shadows are cast in the northeasterly direction. The shadows from

the proposed condominium towers extend across Lick and Alma Avenue to the east and shade a portion of the multi-family residential buildings across Lick and Alma Avenues, as shown on Figure 16.

The proposed project would intermittently shade nearby multi-family residences for brief periods during the afternoon in the winter, spring, and fall. The maximum off-site shading effect would occur on the adjacent child day care site during the mid-winter months. A review of the project's shade/shadow diagrams indicate that substantial portions of the outdoor play area would continue to receive sun throughout the day, and that child activities could be programmed to maximize the use of those areas, particularly in the mid-winter morning and early afternoon hours.

While the proposed project would contribute to the shading effect on the outdoor play area, it would not conflict with any relevant land use plan or policy, and would not substantially impact the ongoing use of the adjacent property as a child daycare center. Even during the winter months, which represent the "worst case" scenario for additional shading of the outdoor play areas by the proposed project, useable portions of the play area would remain unshaded throughout the day, with virtually the entire play area unaffected by shading from the proposed project after mid-afternoon.

### **Zoning, General and Specific Plan Consistency**

The project proposes a Planned Development (PD) rezoning from Light Industrial to A(PD) to allow the development of up to 260 multi-family residential units on the 3.2 acre project site. The project as presently proposed includes 242 multi-family residential units.

The existing City of San Jose General Plan and the Tamien Area Specific Plan land use designation for the project site is *Transit Corridor Residential*. Residential densities at this location are planned at 25 to 150 dwelling units per acre. The density of the proposed design is 76 DU/AC; based upon the allowed units, the density could be as high as 81 DU/AC. The proposed project is consistent with the City of San Jose General Plan and the Tamien Area Specific Plan land use designation for the site.

The project does not conflict with any adopted habitat or other conservation plan.

### **3. Conclusion**

The development of a high density residential complex at this location is consistent with the policies of the San Jose 2020 General Plan, and the adopted Tamien Specific Plan for the area. The proposed project would not be inconsistent with the existing pattern of urban development in the area. High density residential uses would not result in significant land use compatibility impacts with nearby multi-family residential, commercial, and child day care uses.

## J. MINERAL RESOURCES

### 1. Setting

The project site is developed and is located in a developed urban area. The site does not contain any known or designated mineral resources.

### 2. Environmental Checklist

MINERAL RESOURCES						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project:						
1) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2
2) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2

### 3. Conclusion

The project will not result in any impact from the loss of availability of a known mineral resource.

## K. NOISE

The following discussion is based upon a noise analysis and ground-borne vibration assessment completed by *Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc.* in April 2001 and January 2003. Copies of these reports are included as Appendix E of this Initial Study.

### 1. Setting

#### **Background Information**

##### **Noise**

Several factors influence sound as it is perceived by the human ear, including the actual level of sound, the periods of exposure to the sound, the frequencies involved, and fluctuations in the noise level during exposure. Noise is measured on a “decibel” scale which serves as an index of loudness. Because the human ear can not hear all pitches or frequencies, sound levels are frequently adjusted or weighted to correspond to human hearing. This adjusted unit is known as the “A-weighted” decibel or dBA. Further, sound is typically averaged over time. The DNL (day-night level) is a noise descriptor established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to describe the average day-night level with a penalty applied to noise occurring during the nighttime hours (10 PM - 7 AM) to account for the increased sensitivity of people to noise during sleeping hours.

##### **Vibration**

Ground vibration from passing trains consists of rapidly fluctuating motions or waves with an average motion of zero. People's response to ground vibration caused by rail activity has been best correlated to the velocity of ground motion resulting from train pass-bys, expressed on the decibel scale. The abbreviation "VdB" is used in this document for vibration decibels to reduce the potential for confusion with sound decibels. Sixty-five VdB is the approximate threshold of perception for humans. Typical background vibration velocity levels in residential areas are usually 50 VdB or lower, well below the threshold of perception for most humans. Construction activities, train operations and street traffic are some of the most common external sources of vibration that can be perceptible inside residences.

#### **Noise Guidelines**

The Noise Element of the City of San José General Plan contains policies to achieve the City's goal to “minimize the impact of noise on people through noise reduction and suppression techniques and through appropriate land use policies.” The City of San José Noise Element utilizes the DNL descriptor. Land use compatibility guidelines for various community noise levels are described in the Noise Element. The City of San José's long-term outdoor noise level objective is 55 dBA DNL and the short-term outdoor noise level objective is 60 dBA DNL, and 76 dBA DNL as the maximum exterior noise level necessary to avoid significant adverse health effects. The interior noise level objective is 45 dBA DNL.

These objectives are established by the City, recognizing that the attainment of exterior noise quality in the environs of the San José International Airport, the downtown core area, and along major roadways may not be achieved in the time frame of the City's General Plan. To achieve its noise objectives, the City requires appropriate site and building design, building construction, and noise attenuation techniques in new residential development. The State of

California Code of Regulations, Title 24, which applies to all new multi-family housing, specifies that when the exterior noise exposures exceed 60 dBA DNL at planned multi-family dwelling units, an acoustical analysis must be performed to identify appropriate measures to limit interior noise exposures to 45 dBA DNL or less. The State's standards further specify that if windows need to be in the closed position to meet the indoor noise level, then a system for providing ventilation or air conditioning must be included in the design to maintain a habitable interior environment when the windows are closed.

### **Vibration Guidelines**

The City of San José has not adopted goals and policies that can be used to assess vibration on the site associated with train operations on the adjacent railroad lines. Railroad operations are potential sources of substantial ground vibration depending on distance, the type and the speed of trains and the type of railroad track.

Although there are no standards that control the allowable vibration in new residential development within the City of San José, experience with rapid transit systems over the last few decades has begun to lay a foundation for criteria, with the development of rational vibration limits that can be used to evaluate human annoyance to ground-borne vibration. Based on this experience, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) of the U.S. Department of Transportation has developed vibration impact assessment criteria for evaluating vibration impacts associated with rapid transit projects. The FTA vibration standards for residences and buildings where people normally sleep are 72 VdB for frequent events (more than 70 events per day) and 83 VdB for infrequent events (less than 70 events per day). Where freight trains take several minutes to pass a site, due to their length, the FTA recommends applying the infrequent event criterion.

### **Existing Noise Environment**

The noise environment at the project site results from the Southern Pacific railway line which currently carries eight commuter trains and between two and eight freight trains per day, vehicular traffic on Alma and Lick Avenues, and aircraft approaching San Jose International Airport.

### **Existing Noise Levels**

Existing noise levels were measured at the project site over several 24-hour periods in April of 2001 and January of 2003. The noise levels measured at various locations on the site were generated from commuter trains, freight trains, aircraft, and buses and trucks. Average noise levels on the site ranged from 64 dBA DNL in the northwest corner of the site to 75 dBA DNL along the west side of the site. Table 1 summarizes typical maximum noise levels from the various sources, measured at the approximate set back locations of the proposed condominium towers.

<b>Table 1: Measured Maximum Noise Levels at Approximate Building Setback</b>	
<b>Source</b>	<b>Outdoor Lmax</b>
Commuter Train	74 dBA
Freight Train	88 dBA
Jet Flyover	69 dBA
Bus on Alma Avenue	83 dBA

## Existing Vibration Conditions

The Southern Pacific railway lines are located 77 feet from the western property boundary of the project site. The proposed condominium towers are shown as being set back 37 feet from the west property boundary. The Southern Pacific railway line accommodates eight commuter trains and between two and eight freight trains per day. There is a rail switch located near the southern portion of the project site. Due to the switch and the proximity to the Tamien transit station, trains traveling past the site do not exceed 35 mph, and generally less.

Ten to 16 trains pass by the project site each day. To determine existing vibration levels on the project site, measurements were taken at various locations on the northern and southern portions of the site. The vibration measurements and estimated levels from both freight train locomotives and commuter trains at the nearest proposed building setback are provided in Table 2.

Table 2: Measured and Estimated Outdoor Vibration Levels		
Source	South*	North
Commuter Train	77 VdB	67 VdB
Freight Locomotive	82 VdB	77 VdB
Freight Cars	78 VdB	76VdB

\* Values estimated.

## 2. Environmental Checklist and Discussion

NOISE						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project result in:						
1) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,9, 20
2) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	10
3) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9,20
4) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,9,20

NOISE						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project result in:						
5) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,7
6) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,7

## Discussion:

### Impacts to the Project

#### Noise Impacts

A noise impact study was prepared that evaluates average noise levels and “single event” noise levels on the project site. “Single event” noise levels are defined in the noise impact study as typical maximum noise levels that are repeated several times per day; this is not a reference to the maximum noise levels that could ever be expected to occur. The existing average noise levels range from 64 dBA DNL to 75 dBA DNL and maximum “single event” noise levels on the project site range from 69 to 88 dBA. The City of San Jose has no standard for single event noise, nor does the State of California.

Private outdoor spaces, including balconies and front yards of the townhouses, will be exposed to noise levels above the City of San Jose noise guidelines for outdoor use areas. The project proposes a common open space that will meet the 60dBA DNL guideline, and will be available to all residents.

**Impact:** The proposed project would be subject to loud “single-event” noise levels.

**Mitigation and Avoidance:** To reduce the noise impact from very loud single events, the buildings must incorporate sound rated windows, and in some areas exterior wall assemblies that incorporate sound insulating elements, such as resilient channels or double stud construction. Table 3 identifies the approximate sound insulation ratings that will have to be achieved by the composite of exterior walls and windows in order to reduce the “single event” noise levels in bedrooms to 50dBA and in other living spaces to 55dBA.

Final selection of exterior wall assemblies and window types will depend on the specific room dimensions and window dimensions developed during design. Window selection should include consideration of resonant effects of dual pane windows in order to avoid selecting windows that resonate at the same frequencies that dominate noise from diesel



locomotives idling in and near Tamien Station.

Table 3: Estimated Maximum Noise Levels and Approximate Façade Sound Insulation Ratings			
Locations	Estimated Lmax	Façade Assembly Composite Sound Insulation Rating (STC)	
		Sleeping Rooms	Other Living Spaces
Condominium Towers			
West Elevations (facing railroad tracks)	88 dBA	49	45
North and South Elevations	85 dBA	46	42
East Elevation, South Tower	80 dBA	42	38
East Elevation, North Tower	77 dBA	39	35
Townhouses			
East Elevations (Lick Avenue)	80 dBA	42	38
West Elevations	77 <sup>3</sup> dBA	39	35
South Elevation of Southernmost unit	83 dBA	45	41
North Elevation of Northernmost unit	80 dBA	42	38

**Impact:** All of the proposed dwelling units will be exposed to average noise levels above 60 dBA DNL. Private outdoor spaces, including balconies and front yards of the townhouses, will be exposed to noise levels above the City of San Jose noise guidelines.

**Mitigation and Avoidance:** Implementation of the single-event noise mitigation measures listed above will reduce average interior noise levels to below 45 dBA DNL. In accordance with Sate Title 24, a design level noise report will be provided to the City prior to issuance of building permits, to verify that specific building construction will meet interior noise standards.

The project proposes the construction of an eight-foot soundwall along the west side of the common outdoor activity areas shown on the site plan on Figure 4. Shielding provided by the proposed structures and the soundwall would reduce noise levels in the outdoor activity areas on the podium to below 60 dBA DNL.

### ***Vibration Impacts***

The project site boundary is 77 feet from the nearest rail of the Southern Pacific railway line. On the conceptual site plan, the nearest proposed condominium tower is set back 37 feet from the western property boundary.

Ten to 16 trains pass by the project site each day. Based on the criteria set forth by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the indoor residential vibration threshold for this project is 80 VdB for commuter train and freight train locomotives, and 72 VdB for freight train cars, as shown in Table 4.

<sup>3</sup> Assumes shielding from raised podium level between towers, and from tower buildings

The General Vibration Assessment method in Chapter 10 of the FTA document includes correction factors for vibration propagation path and vibration receivers. The applicable factors are for losses that occur as vibration propagates from the soil into the building structure, amplification due to resonance of floors, walls and ceilings, and floor-to-floor attenuation as vibration propagates through the building. Applying these factors yields a downward adjustment of approximately 6 dB from the outdoor vibration levels. Table 4 identifies the resulting estimated interior vibration levels at the first residential floor of the proposed condominium towers.

<b>Table 4: Estimated Indoor Vibration Levels at First Residential Tower Levels</b>			
<b>Source</b>	<b>Vibration Criterion</b>	<b>South</b>	<b>North</b>
Commuter Train	80 VdB	71 VdB	61 VdB
Freight Locomotive		76 VdB	70 VdB
Freight Cars	72 VdB	72 VdB	70 VdB

These estimated indoor vibration levels will approach but will not exceed the FTA criteria. Based on this assessment, vibration from trains is likely to be perceptible to residents of the towers but the noise and vibration consultant believes that it is unlikely to generate widespread complaints.

**Additional Measures Proposed by the Project:** Because the estimated vibration levels are, in some cases, at the criterion level, the building design will include the following precautions to help damp building resonances:

- Build interior partitions full-height, slab-to-slab.
- Avoid long, unsupported spans with post-tension concrete slabs.
- Have the structural and architectural designs reviewed as the project progresses.

### **Impacts from the Project**

#### ***Noise Generated by the Proposed Uses***

The proposed project would generate noises and noise levels consistent with a multi-family residential development. On-site noise generated by the proposed uses will, therefore, not result in significant off-site impacts.

#### ***Noise Generated by Project Traffic***

Project-generated traffic will cause noise levels to increase less than one-half decibel along Lick and Alma Avenues, which will be an inaudible difference. Project-generated noise from vehicular traffic will, therefore, be less than significant.

## Construction Noise

The project will result in temporary noise increases due to demolition and construction activities on the site, and the installation of the water main within Lick Avenue between Willow Street and Alma Avenue. Intermittent noise will result from the operation of heavy equipment during construction, which may include excavation and recycling of concrete and paving. Construction noise levels will fluctuate depending on the construction phase, equipment type, the duration of use, and the distance between the noise source and receptor. Pile driving is not proposed by the project.

Construction noise sources typically generate noise levels of about 88 to 89 dBA. Given the proximity of adjacent residential land uses to the construction activities, all phases of project construction, especially demolition and the construction of project infrastructure, will likely exceed the ambient noise environment at these adjacent receptors, and may interfere with normal activities during busy construction periods.

Typically, residential, commercial, or office construction projects do not generate significant noise impacts when standard construction noise control measures are enforced at the project site and when the duration of the noise generating construction period is limited to one construction season (typically one year) or less.

**Impact:** The proposed project will result in an increase of noise levels in the project area during demolition and construction activities on the site and along Lick Avenue, which will result in a significant temporary noise impact to nearby residences.

**Mitigation and Avoidance:** The following mitigation measures will be implemented to reduce potential temporary noise impacts to a less than significant level.

- Noise-generating activities associated with construction of the project in any way will be restricted to the hours from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday within 500 feet of residences. No construction activities will occur within 500 feet of residences on Saturdays, Sundays or holidays.
- Noise barriers will be erected to shield adjacent noise-sensitive land uses from construction noise prior to the demolition phase of the project. If it is not possible to construct permanent noise barriers during the first phase of project construction, temporary plywood noise barriers will be used to shield nearby residences and the child care center. The temporary noise barriers should be at least 8 feet in height to be effective.
- All internal combustion engine driven equipment will be equipped with intake and exhaust mufflers which are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.
- Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines will be strictly prohibited.
- Staging of construction equipment within 200 feet of residences will be avoided as much as possible and all stationary noise-generating construction equipment, such as air compressors, portable power generators, or concrete crushers will be located as far as practical from existing noise sensitive receptors. Temporary barriers to screen stationary noise generating equipment will be used in areas adjoining noise sensitive land uses.

- “Quiet” air compressors and other stationary noise sources will be used where technology exists.
- All construction traffic to and from the project site will be routed via Lick Avenue.
- Control noise from construction workers’ radios to the point where they are not audible at existing residences bordering the project site.
- Residents adjacent to the project site will be notified of the construction schedule in writing.
- Designate a "noise disturbance coordinator" who will be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator will determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and will require that reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem be implemented. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the disturbance coordinator at the construction site and include it in the notice sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule.
- If the project proposes to recycle the demolition debris, a noise control plan will be prepared by a qualified noise consultant and submitted to the Director of Planning prior to approval of the PD permit. The plan may include such measures as the construction of noise barriers or using existing buildings as noise barriers, and controlled hours of operation.

### **3. Conclusion**

Private outdoor spaces, including balconies and front yards of the townhouses, will be exposed to noise levels above the City of San Jose noise guidelines for outdoor use areas. Because the City of San Jose General Plan recognizes that attainment of the outdoor noise level objectives along the major roadways may not be achieved in the time frame of the General Plan, and because this project does provide common open space that will meet the noise guideline of 60 dBA DNL, this is not considered a significant impact.

The proposed project, with implementation of the mitigation and avoidance measures described above, will not result in significant noise and vibration impacts.

## L. POPULATION AND HOUSING

### 1. Setting

According to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) the City of San José's population for 2000 was 928,100 with 276,490 households. For 2020 the projected population is 1,047,800 and 325,310 households.

POPULATION AND HOUSING						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project:						
1) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
2) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
3) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1

### 2. Environmental Checklist and Discussion

The proposed project would allow for the development of up to 260 residential units within the transit core of the Tamien Station Area Planned Community Specific Plan. The General Plan and Specific Plan land use designation for the project site is *Transit Corridor Residential*. Residential densities at this location are planned at 25 to 150 dwelling units per acre. The project will increase the population of San Jose consistent with approved plans.

The proposed project will not induce substantial job growth or displace either housing or persons.

### 3. Conclusion

The proposed project will not result in significant adverse impacts on population and housing in the City or region.

## **M. PUBLIC SERVICES**

### **1. Setting**

#### **Police Service**

Police protection services are provided to the project site by the City of San José Police Department (SJPD). Officers patrolling the project area are dispatched from police headquarters, located at 201 West Mission Street. The SJPD presently consists of approximately 1,411 sworn officers and 402 civilian personnel.

The SJPD consists of 83 Beats. Each beat is assigned to one of 16 Districts. The Beats are identified with a number and the Districts are identified with a letter. The project site is located in District S, Beat 5 of the SJPD's service area. In 2000, District S had 3,491 crimes, consisting of 1,233 felonies and 2,258 misdemeanors. The most frequent felonies in the project area included narcotics felonies, and aggravated assault. The most frequent misdemeanors included simple assault and malicious mischief.

#### **Fire Service**

Fire protection to the project site is provided by the San José Fire Department. The initial first alarm assignment for fires in high rise buildings is two engines, two trucks/urban search and rescue vehicles (USARS), and one battalion chief. The fire station nearest the project site is located at 98 Martha Street (Station #3). Response times for the truck and engine company from Station #3 are anticipated to be four and one-half minutes and four minutes, respectively. The second responding engine company is located at 1686 Cherry Street (Station #6), and will have a response time of approximately four minutes. The battalion chief and the second responding truck company will arrive from Station #1, located at 225 North Market Street. Response times for the battalion chief and the second arriving truck company will be approximately six minutes and 8 minutes, respectively. All City of San José fire and emergency response teams include paramedics.

#### **Schools**

The City of San José is served by a total of 19 public school districts, serving elementary, middle, and high school students. Thirteen of these districts are elementary school districts, three are high school districts and three are unified school districts. The project site is located within the boundary of the San José Unified School District.

#### **Parks**

The closest regional park to the project site is Kelley Park which is located approximately one and one-quarter miles east of the project site at the intersection of Story Road and Senter Road. The closest community parks in the project area include Beirbach Park which is located approximately one mile north of the project site at the corner of Virginia Street and Willis Avenue, and River Glen Park which is located approximately three-quarters of a mile south of the project site at the corner of Pine Avenue and Bird Avenue.

#### **Libraries**

The San José Public Library System consists of one main library and 17 branch libraries. The Dr. Martin Luther King Junior Main Library is located adjacent to the Convention

Center downtown, and the 17 library branches are located throughout the City. A new city library, which is a joint project between the City and San José State University, is currently under construction at the corner of San Fernando and 4th Streets, in downtown San José. The branch libraries nearest the site include the Biblioteca Latinoamericana located at 921 South First Street, and the Willow Glen Branch Library at 1157 Minnesota Avenue. All branch libraries area planned to be expanded over the next ten years with funding from the Measure O Library Bond approved by the City voters in 2000.

## 2. Environmental Checklist and Discussion

PUBLIC SERVICES						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project:						
1) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:						
Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	21
Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
Other Public Facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1

### Discussion:

#### Fire Protection

Fire protection to the project site is provided by the City of San José Fire Department. The fire department has reviewed the plans for the proposed project. The project will be designed and built to meet current City codes, especially fire codes, to ensure the efficient provision of these services to the site. While adherence to codes will minimize the potential damage and risk from fire, the existing laws represent minimum standards and do not safeguard against all hazards. Therefore, the project may be required during the City's design review process to include additional safety measures to ensure adequate fire protection and emergency response.

#### Police Protection

Police protection to the project site is provided by the City of San José. Development of the proposed project will increase calls for service, but will not require construction of a new facility.

## **Schools**

The proposed project will allow the construction of up to 260 residential units on the project site. Based on the San José Unified School District's student generation rate of 0.20 for grades kindergarten through high school, the proposed project would generate approximately 52 students.

State law (Government Code Section 65996) specifies an acceptable method of offsetting a project's effect on the adequacy of school facilities as the payment of a school impact fee prior to issuance of building permit. In San José, development project applicants can either negotiate directly with the affected school district(s), or they can make a "presumptive payment" of \$1.93 per square foot for multi-family units. The school district is responsible for implementing the specific methods for mitigating school effects under the Government Code. The school impact fees and the school districts' methods of implementing measures specified by Government Code 65996 would partially offset project-related increases in student enrollment. No new school will need to be built to serve students generated by this project.

## **Parks**

The proposed project will provide private and common open space in conformance with the City's adopted Residential Design Guidelines. The Guidelines specify a minimum of 60 square feet of private outdoor space such as balconies and 100 square feet of usable common open space for every dwelling unit.

The proposed project does not propose the construction of a new park.

The City of San José's Parkland Dedication Ordinance requires that new residential development either dedicate sufficient space to serve new residents, or pay fees calculated to offset the increased costs of providing new park facilities for new development. This new ordinance is intended to reduce the extent to which new development will exacerbate the existing shortfall of park and recreational facilities. The project will pay the appropriate fees.

Construction of the proposed project is not expected to increase demand on existing parks to such an extent as to cause a substantial physical decline.

## **Libraries**

Construction of the proposed project is not anticipated to substantially increase demand on libraries in the project area.

### **3. Conclusion**

The proposed project will not result in any significant impacts on the environment as a result of increased demand on public services.



## N. RECREATION

### 1. Setting

The City of San José provides park lands, open space, and community facilities for public recreation and community services. Some of these facilities are provided in conjunction with, or are supplemented by, other public uses such as County parks and lands used for flood control purposes. Parks and recreation facilities vary in size, use, type of service, and provide for city, regional, and neighborhood uses. The City Department of Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Services is responsible for the construction, operation and maintenance of all City parks and recreational facilities.

The City of San José has established level of service benchmarks for park land and community centers. These levels of service area as follows: 3.5 acres of neighborhood and community serving recreational lands per 1,000 population, of which a minimum of 1.5 acres must be City owned neighborhood or community park lands, up to 2 acres can be provided by school playgrounds, and all should be located within reasonable walking distance; 7.5 acres of regional/City-wide park lands per 1,000 population; and 500 square feet of community center space per 1,000 population. These goals have not been met within the City.

The closest regional park to the project site is Kelley Park which is located approximately one and one-quarter miles east of the project site at the intersection of Story Road and Senter Road. The closest community parks in the project area include Beirbach Park which is located approximately one mile north of the project site at the corner of Virginia Street and Willis Avenue, and River Glen Park which is located approximately three-quarters of a mile south of the project site at the corner of Pine Avenue and Bird Avenue.

### 2. Environmental Checklist and Discussion

RECREATION						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project:						
1) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
2) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1

**Discussion:** The proposed project will provide on-site recreational facilities for the use of future residents. These facilities will not themselves, cause a significant environmental impact.

Construction of the proposed project is not expected to substantially increase demand on existing recreational facilities such that physical deterioration will be accelerated.

### **3. Conclusion**

The proposed project will not result in any significant impacts on the environment as a result of the use or construction of recreational facilities.

## **O. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

The following discussion is based upon a transportation impact analysis completed by *Fehr and Peers Associates, Inc.*, in June, 2003. The report is included as Appendix F of this Initial Study.

### **1. Setting**

#### **Existing Conditions**

The purpose of this analysis is to identify the potential impacts of the proposed development on the transportation system in the vicinity of the project site. Project impacts were evaluated following the guidelines of the City of San Jose and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), which is the congestion management agency for Santa Clara County. The operations of the following key intersections were evaluated during the morning (AM) and evening (PM) peak periods:

1. Willow Road and Lick Avenue
2. Willow Road and Vine Street
3. Willow Road and Almaden Avenue
4. Lelong Street and SR 87 Ramps
5. Lelong Street and Alma Avenue
6. Lick Avenue and Alma Avenue
7. Alma Avenue and Vine Street
8. Alma Avenue and Almaden Avenue

#### **Roadway Network**

Regional access to the project site is provided by I-280, SR 87, and SR 82. Local access to the site is provided by Willow Street, Alma Avenue, and Lick Avenue.

*I-280* extends southward from San Francisco through Los Altos, Sunnyvale, Cupertino, and into San Jose. In the vicinity of the project site, this freeway is oriented in an east-west direction and includes four lanes in each direction plus auxiliary lanes on some segments. The interchange at Bird Avenue and Seventh Street provides access to the site as well as the off-ramp at Vine Street and Almaden Avenue for eastbound vehicles.

*SR 87* is a four-lane north-south freeway that begins in South San Jose at SR 85 and extends north through downtown San Jose, where it becomes Guadalupe Parkway at Taylor Street. Vehicles traveling to and from the south would use the Curtner Avenue interchange, while vehicles destined for vehicles north would use the Alma Avenue interchange to access the project site.

*SR 82* is a four- to six-lane north-south major roadway that begins in Gilroy and extends north through San Jose. In the vicinity of the project site, SR 82 is known as Monterey Road to the south of Alma Avenue and First Street to the north. First Street provides two lanes in each direction.

*Willow Street* is a two- to four-lane east-west collector that begins at First Street and extends west of Meridian Avenue. In the vicinity of the project site, Willow Street is a two-lane roadway with a posted speed limit of 25 miles per hour (mph).

*Alma Avenue* is a two- to four-lane roadway that extends west from Senter Road and becomes Minnesota Avenue. In the vicinity of the project site, Alma Avenue provides a four-lane roadway with a posted speed limit of 35 mph.

*Lick Avenue* is a two-lane roadway between Willow Street and Alma Avenue. Direct access to the project site would be provided via a driveway on Lick Avenue.

### **Existing Transit Service**

The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) operates bus and light rail transit (LRT) service in Santa Clara County. Commuter rail service (CalTrain) is provided between San Francisco and Gilroy and is operated by the Peninsula Joint Powers Board. The existing transit facilities in the vicinity of the site are shown on Figure 3 in Appendix F of this Initial Study. The individual bus routes and rail lines are described below:

*Route 25* provides bus service between east San Jose and De Anza College. It operates along Willow Street, near the project site. Route 25 operates from 4:30 am to 12:30 am on weekdays on a 10- to 60-minute headway. Weekend service is provided between 5:30 am to midnight on a 15- to 60-minute headway.

*Route 66* provides bus service between Santa Teresa Hospital and Milpitas. It operates along First Street and Monterey Road near the project site. Route 66 operates from 4:30 am to midnight on weekdays on a 15- to 60-minute headway. Weekend service is provided between 5:30 am to 11:30 pm on a 30- to 60-minute headway.

*Route 68* provides bus service between the San Jose Diridon Station and Gilroy. It operates along First Street and Monterey Road near the project site. Route 68 operates from 4:30 am to 1:30 am on weekdays on a 15- to 60-minute headway. Weekend service is provided between 5:45 am to 1:15 am on a 30- to 60-minute headway.

*Route 82* provides bus service between 19th and Mission Streets and the Westgate shopping center. It operates along Alma Avenue near the project site. Route 82 operates from 5:15 am to 9:30 pm on weekdays on 30-minute headways. Weekend services are provided between 6:45 am and 7:30 pm on 45-minute headways.

The *Guadalupe Light Rail Transit (LRT)* line provides service between south San Jose (Santa Teresa and Almaden) and north San Jose (Baypointe). Service is provided every 10 minutes during the commute hours. The Tamien Station (Lelong Street/Alma Avenue) is immediately adjacent to the project site.

The *Tasman West LRT* line provides service between north San Jose and Mountain View. Service is provided every 10 minutes during the commute hours. The Baypointe Station is the transfer point from the Guadalupe LRT line to the Tasman West line.

The *Tasman East LRT* line will provide service between north San Jose and Milpitas. This line is currently operating to the Tasman/I-880 station near Alder and is anticipated to be extended to Capitol Expressway and Hostetter Road by Summer 2004.

*CalTrain* provides frequent train service between San Jose and San Francisco seven days a week. During commute hours, CalTrain provides extended service to Morgan Hill and Gilroy. The Tamien Station, located at Lelong Street and Alma Avenue, is the closest station

to the project site. Access to the station is also provided via Lick Avenue approximately 500 feet from the project site.

### **Existing Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities**

Pedestrian facilities comprise sidewalks, crosswalks, and pedestrian signals. Sidewalks are provided on both sides of Lick Avenue and both sides of Alma Avenue adjacent to the project site. Crosswalks and pedestrian signals are provided at most of the key study intersections.

Bicycle facilities comprise bike paths, bike lanes, and bike routes. Bike paths are paved trails that are separated from the roadways. Bike lanes are lanes on roadways designated for use by bicycles by striping, pavement legends, and signs. Bike routes are roadways that are designated for bicycle use with signs. In the vicinity of the site, bike lanes are located on Willow Street west of SR 87. A multi-use trail is located along SR 87 from Willow Street south to Santa Teresa Boulevard.

### **Existing Traffic Volumes and Lane Configurations**

In conformance with the City's level of service policy, the key intersections were analyzed under weekday AM and PM peak-hour traffic conditions. Peak conditions usually occur during the morning and evening commute periods between 7:00 and 9:00 am, and between 4:00 and 6:00 pm, respectively. Intersection operations were evaluated for the one hour during each of these periods with the highest measured traffic volumes. Available existing peak-hour traffic counts were obtained and supplemented with new counts conducted during the week of November 18, 2002. The new counts are contained in Appendix E.

#### ***Intersections***

The level of service methodology approved by the City of San Jose and the VTA evaluates an intersection's operation based on the average stopped vehicular delay calculated using methods described in Chapter 9 of the *1985 Highway Capacity Manual* with adjusted saturation flow rates. The average delay for signalized intersections is calculated using the TRAFFIX analysis software and is correlated to a level of service designation as shown in Table 5. The level of service standard for City of San Jose intersections is LOS D.

For unsignalized intersections (four way stop controlled and side street stop controlled), the level of service calculations were conducted using the methodology contained in Chapter 17 of the *2000 Highway Capacity Manual*, as summarized in Table 6.

#### ***Freeway Segments***

Freeway segments were evaluated using the methodology required by the VTA. The VTA's analysis procedure is based on the density of the traffic flow using methods described in the *1994 Highway Capacity Manual*. Density is expressed in passenger cars per mile per lane. The Congestion Management Program freeway segment level of service criteria are shown in Table 7. These criteria are based on the 1994 HCM level of service criteria with adjustments to reflect local (Santa Clara County) conditions.

<b>Table 5: Signalized Intersection Level of Service Definitions</b>		
<b>Level of Service</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Average Stopped Delay Per Vehicle (Seconds)</b>
A	Operations with very low delay occurring with favorable progression and/or short cycle length.	≤ 5.0
B+ B B-	Operations with low delay occurring with good progression and/or short cycle lengths.	5.1 to 7.0 7.1 to 13.0 13.1 to 15.0
C+ C C-	Operations with average delays resulting from fair progression and/or longer cycle lengths. Individual cycle failures begin to appear.	15.1 to 17.0 17.1 to 23.0 23.1 to 25.0
D+ D D-	Operations with longer delays due to a combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle lengths, and high V/C ratios. Many vehicles stop and individual cycle failures are noticeable.	25.1 to 28.0 28.1 to 37.0 37.1 to 40.0
E+ E E-	Operations with high delay values indicating poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high V/C ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences.	40.1 to 44.0 44.1 to 56.0 56.1 to 60.0
F	Operations with delays unacceptable to most drivers occurring due to over-saturation, poor progression, or very long cycle lengths.	> 60.0
Source: VTA's CMP <i>Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines</i> , May 7, 1998, and Transportation Research Board, <i>Highway Capacity Manual</i> , Special Report 209, 1994.		

<b>Table 6: Level of Service Criteria for Unsignalized Intersections</b>		
<b>Level of Service</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Average Control Delay Per Vehicle (Seconds)</b>
A	Little or no delay	≤ 10.0
B	Short traffic delays	10.1 to 15.0
C	Average traffic delays	15.1 to 25.0
D	Long traffic delays	25.1 to 35.0
E	Very long traffic delays	35.1 to 50.0
F	Extreme traffic delays with intersection capacity exceeded	> 50.0
Source: Transportation Research Board, <i>Highway Capacity Manual</i> , 2000.		

<b>Table 7: Density-Based Freeway Level of Service Criteria</b>	
<b>Level of Service</b>	<b>Density (vehicles/mile/lane)</b>
A	≤ 10
B	10.0 to 16.0
C	16.0 to 24.0
D	24.0 to 46.0
E	46.0 to 55.0
F	> 55.0
Source: VTA's CMP <i>Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines</i> , May 7, 1998.	

### ***Existing Intersection Levels of Service***

Current operations of the study intersections were evaluated with the existing volumes, existing lane configurations, and signal phasings/timings used as inputs to the TRAFFIX level of service calculation program. The results are presented in Table 8. The level of service calculation sheets are contained in Appendix E. The unsignalized intersection of Lelong Street/SR 87 Ramps is currently operating at LOS F during the AM peak hour. The remaining study intersections are operating at LOS C or above.

<b>Table 8: Existing Intersection Levels of Service</b>				
<b>Intersection</b>	<b>Peak Hour</b>	<b>Count Date</b>	<b>Average Intersection Delay<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>LOS<sup>2</sup></b>
Willow Road and Lick Avenue (unsignalized)	AM	11/21/02	11.1	B
	PM	11/21/02	11.7	B
Willow Road and Vine Street	AM	11/21/02	5.6	B+
	PM	11/21/02	10.9	B
Willow Road and Almaden Avenue	AM	11/21/02	9.4	B
	PM	11/21/02	10.1	B
Lelong Street and SR 87 Ramps (unsignalized)	AM	11/21/02	52.2	F
	PM	11/21/02	17.1	C
Lelong Street and Alma Avenue	AM	11/19/02	20.9	C
	PM	11/19/02	18.3	C
Lick Avenue and Alma Avenue	AM	2/28/02	8.2	B
	PM	2/28/02	10.0	B
Alma Avenue and Vine Street	AM	2/28/02	9.0	B
	PM	2/28/02	15.6	C+
Alma Avenue and Almaden Avenue	AM	11/21/02	13.2	B-
	PM	11/20/02	20.8	C
Notes: <sup>1</sup> Whole intersection weighted average delay expressed in seconds per vehicle. <sup>2</sup> LOS calculations performed using the CMP level of service analysis program, TRAFFIX, and the 1985 <i>Highway Capacity Manual</i> delay methodology for signalized intersections with adjusted saturation flow rates.				

## Background Conditions

Background conditions are defined as conditions likely to exist prior to completion of the proposed development. Traffic volumes for background conditions comprise existing volumes from counts plus traffic generated by approved developments in the area. The following discussion describes the procedure used to estimate the background traffic volumes and the roadway improvements anticipated to be in place. The results of the level of service analysis for background conditions are also presented.

### *Background Traffic Estimates*

The traffic volumes for background conditions were estimated by adding existing volumes and Approved Trip Inventory (ATI) volumes (see Appendix E). ATI volumes are traffic projections generated by approved but not yet constructed projects in the study area that are assigned to the roadway system. Background traffic volumes are shown in Appendix E.

<b>Table 9: Background Intersection Levels of Service</b>			
<b>Intersection</b>	<b>Peak Hour</b>	<b>Average Intersection Delay<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>LOS<sup>2</sup></b>
Willow Road and Lick Avenue (unsignalized)	AM	11.1	B
	PM	11.7	B
Willow Road and Vine Street	AM	5.5	B+
	PM	10.4	B
Willow Road and Almaden Avenue	AM	8.4	B
	PM	10.2	B
Lelong Street and SR 87 Ramps (unsignalized)	AM	52.2	F
	PM	17.1	C
Lelong Street and Alma Avenue	AM	20.9	C
	PM	18.3	C
Lick Avenue and Alma Avenue	AM	8.2	B
	PM	10.0	B
Alma Avenue and Vine Street	AM	9.1	C
	PM	15.7	C+
Alma Avenue and Almaden Avenue	AM	11.3	B
	PM	18.8	C
Notes: <sup>1</sup> Average stopped delay expressed in seconds per vehicle.			
<sup>2</sup> LOS = Level of service. Calculations performed using the 1985 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology for signalized intersections with adjusted saturation flow rates.			

### *Background Intersection Levels of Service*

Levels of service were calculated for the study intersections using the background traffic volumes. Table 9 presents the LOS calculation results for the study intersections. The LOS calculation worksheets are contained in Appendix E. Under Background Conditions all the study intersections are projected to operate at acceptable levels of service except the Lelong Street/SR 87 Ramps intersection during the AM peak hour.



## 2. Environmental Checklist and Discussion

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project:						
1) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio of roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	17
2) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	17
3) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,7
4) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible land uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	17
5) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,17
6) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,4,18
7) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,17

**Discussion:** For the purposes of this project, a traffic impact is considered significant if the project would:

- Cause a *local* City of San José intersection to deteriorate below LOS D, or if the intersection is already operating at LOS E or F, cause an increase in the average stopped delay for the critical movements by four seconds or more *and* the critical V/C value to increase by 0.01 or more.

### Project Conditions

The discussion below summarizes the analysis of traffic impacts done for the proposed project. First, the methodology used to estimate the amount of traffic generated by the proposed project is described. Then, results of the level of service calculations for project

conditions are presented. Project conditions are defined as background conditions plus traffic generated by the proposed project. Project impacts are then identified by comparing the LOS results under project conditions to those under background conditions.

### ***Project Traffic Estimates***

The amount of traffic associated with a project is estimated using a three-step process: (1) trip generation, (2) trip distribution, and (3) trip assignment. In the first step, the amounts of traffic entering and exiting the project site are estimated on a daily and peak-hour basis. In the second step, the directions the trips will use to approach and depart the site are estimated. The trips are assigned to specific street segments and intersection turning movements in the third step. The results of this process for this project analysis are described in the following sections.

### ***Trip Generation***

The amount of traffic generated by the proposed residential development was estimated by applying the trip rates published in the *Interim Guidelines for Traffic Impact Analysis of Land Developments* (City of San Jose Department of Public Works, June 1994). The project trips used in the analysis were calculated based on 260 multi-family residential units, as allowed by the proposed zoning. The project trip generation estimates are presented in Table 10. Per VTA guidelines, a nine percent reduction was applied to the trip rates because the Tamien LRT/CalTrain Station is located within 2,000 feet of the project site. The proposed project is estimated to generate 1,774 daily trips, 178 AM peak-hour trips (62 inbound/116 outbound), and 178 PM peak-hour trips (116 inbound/62 outbound).

Table 10: Project Trip Generation Rates and Estimates								
Land Use	Size	Time Period	Trip Rate	Directional Split		Number of Trips		
				In	Out	In	Out	Total
Apartment	260 units	Daily	6.825	50%	50%	887	887	1774
		AM	0.685	35%	65%	62	116	178
		PM	0.685	65%	35%	116	62	178
Source: Trip rates were obtained from <i>Interim Guidelines for TIA of Land Developments</i> (City of San Jose Department of Public Works, June 1994). A reduction of nine percent was applied to the trip rate due to the location of the Tamien LRT/CalTrain Station per VTA guidelines.								

### ***Trip Distribution***

The trip distribution pattern for the proposed residential development was estimated based on existing travel patterns in the vicinity of the site and the relative locations of complementary land uses in the area. The major directions of approach and departure for the project site are provided in Appendix E.

### ***Trip Assignment***

Trips generated by the proposed project were assigned to the roadway system based on the directions of approach and departure described above. The trip assignments for both peak hours are provided in Appendix E. Project trips were added to Background traffic volumes to estimate volumes under Project Conditions.

### Project Intersection Levels of Service

Intersection level of service calculations were made to evaluate the operating conditions of the intersections with project traffic and the potential impacts of the proposed project on the local roadway system. The results of the intersection level of service calculations for background and project conditions for the study intersections are summarized in Table 11. The increases in critical movement delays due to the addition of project traffic for the study intersections are also shown in Table 11.

<b>Table 11: Background and Project Intersection Levels of Service</b>							
<b>Intersection</b>	<b>Peak Hour</b>	<b>Background</b>		<b>Project</b>			
		<b>Delay<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>LOS<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Delay</b>	<b>LOS</b>	<b>D in Crit. V/C<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>D in Crit. Delay<sup>4</sup></b>
Willow Road and Lick Avenue (unsignalized)	AM	11.1	B	11.3	B	na	na
	PM	11.7	B	11.9	B	na	na
Willow Road and Vine Street	AM	5.5	B+	5.5	B+	0.012	0.1
	PM	10.4	B	10.5	B	0.007	0.2
Willow Road and Almaden Avenue	AM	8.4	B	8.8	B	0.011	0.5
	PM	10.2	B	10.2	B	0.005	0.0
Lelong Street and SR 87 Ramps (unsignalized)	AM	52.2	F	73.6	F	na	na
	PM	17.1	C	21.1	C	na	na
Lelong Street and Alma Avenue	AM	20.9	C	21.4	C	0.035	0.5
	PM	18.3	C	19.1	C	0.041	0.7
Lick Avenue and Alma Avenue	AM	8.2	B	11.1	B	0.059	4.1
	PM	10.0	B	12.1	B	0.058	3.1
Alma Avenue and Vine Street	AM	9.1	C	9.0	C	0.058	4.1
	PM	15.7	C+	15.9	C+	0.056	3.2
Alma Avenue and Almaden Avenue	AM	11.3	B	11.4	B	0.004	-0.1
	PM	18.8	C	19.0	C	0.018	0.3
Notes: <sup>1</sup> Average stopped delay expressed in seconds per vehicle. <sup>2</sup> LOS = Level of service. Calculations performed using the <i>1985 Highway Capacity Manual</i> (HCM) methodology for signalized intersections with adjusted saturation flow rates. <sup>3</sup> Increase in the critical volume-to-capacity ratio from Background to Project Conditions. <sup>4</sup> Increase in critical movement delay from Background to Project Condition. Significant impacts are shown in <b>bold</b> type.							

The results of the level of service calculations indicate that all eight key intersections will continue operating at the same level of service during both peak hours under project conditions as under background conditions. The project will, however, increase congestion and delay at the unsignalized Lelong/SR 87 Ramps intersection. The delay is caused by a combination of operational issues, including congestion on SR 87, the metering light at the northbound 87 onramp, the right turn movement at the intersection of Lelong/SR87, and the existing volume of traffic passing through the intersection. The installation of a signal at this intersection will not result in a real improvement in the level of congestion at this intersection. This is not an a CEQA impact under the LOS policy of the City of San Jose and it is the professional opinion of the traffic engineer that the increase in delay will not result in a safety impact.

### ***Freeway Segment Level of Service Analysis***

According to CMP guidelines, freeway segments to which a proposed development is projected to add trips equal to or greater than one percent of the freeway segment's capacity must be evaluated. Segments of I-280 and SR 87 were reviewed to determine if a significant amount of project traffic would be added to these freeway segments. Capacities of 2,200 vehicles per hour per lane (vphpl) for four-lane freeways and 2,300 vphpl for freeway segments with six or more lanes were used in the analysis. .

Table 12 presents the capacities of each freeway segment and the estimated number of trips added to each segment by the proposed project. The project would not add traffic greater than one percent of capacity to any of the freeway segments. Therefore, the project's impact on these segments is considered less than significant per VTA guidelines.

<b>Table 12: Project Freeway Segment Capacity Analysis</b>				
<b>Segment</b>	<b>Capacity<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>1% of Capacity</b>	<b>Project Trips AM (PM)</b>	<b>Requires Analysis?</b>
Eastbound I-280, SR 87 to Bird	9,200	92	9(18)	No (No)
Westbound I-280, SR 87 to Bird	9,200	92	18(9)	No (No)
Eastbound I-280, Tenth to SR 87	9,200	92	18(9)	No (No)
Westbound I-280, Tenth to SR 87	9,200	92	9(18)	No (No)
Northbound SR 87, Capitol Exp to Curtner	4,400	44	12(23)	No (No)
Southbound SR 87, Capitol Exp to Curtner	4,400	44	23(12)	No (No)
Northbound SR 87, Curtner to Almaden Exp	4,400	44	0(0)	No (No)
Southbound SR 87, Curtner to Almaden Exp	4,400	44	0(0)	No (No)
Northbound SR 87, Almaden Exp to Alma	4,400	44	0(0)	No (No)
Southbound SR 87, Almaden Exp to Alma	4,400	44	0(0)	No (No)
Northbound SR 87, Alma to I-280	4,400	44	18(9)	No (No)
Southbound SR 87, Alma to I-280	4,400	44	9(18)	No (No)
Notes: <sup>1</sup> A capacity of 2,200 vehicles per hour per lane was used for four-lane freeway segments, while a capacity of 2,300 vehicles per hour per lane was used for freeway segments with six or more lanes. Auxiliary lanes and HOV lanes were not included in the calculation of the capacity.				

### ***Proposed Parking***

The proposed project includes 112 one bedroom units, 114 two bedroom units, two three bedroom units, and 14 townhouses. Based on the parking requirements in the City of San Jose Residential Design Guidelines<sup>4</sup> (1.5 spaces per one-bedroom unit, 1.8 spaces per two-bedroom unit, 2 spaces per three-bedroom unit, and 2 covered spaces per townhouse plus one additional off-lot parking space within 150 feet), the proposed project will require a total of 419 parking spaces, including 377 open parking spaces for the one, two and three bedroom

<sup>4</sup> The City of San Jose Residential Design Guidelines defines open parking as any parking provided outside of an individually enclosed garage with a door and includes carports and parking garages within or under buildings.

units, and 42 parking spaces for the townhouses. Due to the close proximity of the Tamien CalTrain/LRT station, this project is eligible for a ten percent reduction of parking supply. This reduces the number of required parking spaces to 377 spaces. The project site plan shows a supply of 392 off-street parking spaces and seven on-street parking spaces on Lick Avenue. The proposed parking supply exceeds the requirement set forth in the Residential Design Guidelines and is considered adequate.

### **Water Main Extension**

The proposed project includes the installation of an approximately 2,440-foot water main within the public right-of-way of Lick Avenue between Willow Street and Alma Avenue. Installation of the water main will take approximately two weeks, during which time through traffic on Lick Avenue will be limited to one lane in the area of construction. Installation of the water main will be temporary and will not substantially affect roadway operations in the project area.

### **3. Conclusion**

The proposed project will not result in significant transportation impacts.

## **P. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

### **1. Setting**

The project site is currently developed and is served with sanitary sewer, storm drainage, and water service. Electricity, gas, and solid waste collection service is also currently provided to the site.

#### **Water**

Water service to the project site is provided by San Jose Water Company. Existing water flow at the project site is 2,500 gallons per minute (GPM).

#### **Sanitary Sewer/Wastewater Treatment**

Sanitary sewer service and sewage treatment is provided to the project site by the City of San Jose. Sanitary sewer lines are located along Lick Avenue and Alma Avenue at the project site. There is a 21-inch line along the project's frontage in Lick Avenue and a 10-inch line along the projects frontage in Alma Avenue. The sanitary sewer line along Alma Avenue expands to 21 inches east of Lick Avenue. The San Jose/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant provides tertiary treatment of the wastewater.

#### **Storm Drainage**

Storm drainage service is provided to the project site by the City of San Jose. Storm drainage lines are located along the project's frontage in Lick Avenue and west of the project site in Alma Avenue at the State Route 87 underpass. Stormwater runoff from the project site eventually discharges into the Guadalupe River.

#### **Solid Waste**

Solid waste collected from residences within San Jose is disposed of at Newby Island Landfill under an agreement between the City of San Jose and the landfill. Collection of solid waste and recyclables from multi-family housing is provided in San Jose by Green Team. According to the Source Reduction and Recycling Element prepared for the City of San Jose and the County-wide Integrated Waste Management Plan, there is sufficient land fill capacity to meet the needs of Santa Clara County for at least 28 more years.

## 2. Environmental Checklist and Discussion

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
Would the project:						
1) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
2) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
3) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
4) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
5) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
6) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
7) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2

**Discussion:** The project site is currently served with all necessary utilities. The proposed project will complete the underground conversion of electrical and phone lines along the project's Lick Avenue frontage. The proposed project site will increase in the demand for wastewater treatment. Department of Public Works initial review of the project did not find that the project will exceed the capacity of the existing sanitary sewer system. The proposed project will not increase impervious surfaces and, therefore, will not exceed the capacity of the existing stormwater drainage system.

The existing water flow at the project site does not meet the San Jose Fire Department's (SJFD) fire flow requirements for the proposed project. SJFD has indicated that a water

flow of 4,500 GPM is needed for the purpose of fire suppression. The existing water flow at the project site is 2,500 GPM.

**Impact:** The existing water flow at the project site does not meet the San Jose Fire Department's fire flow requirements.

**Mitigation and Avoidance:** The following mitigation measures will reduce the utility impact to a less than significant level:

- A 2,440-foot, 16-inch, water main will be installed by the project within the public right-of-way of Lick Avenue between Willow Street and Alma Avenue. The 16-inch water main will provide a fire flow of at least 4,500 GPM.

### **3. Conclusion**

The proposed project, with implementation of the mitigation measure described above, will not exceed the capacity of existing utility systems.



<b>Q. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Beneficial Impact	Information Source(s)
1) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,9,10
2) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
3) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19

**Discussion:** See discussion in previous sections regarding project impacts.

## Checklist Sources

1. CEQA Guidelines - Environmental Thresholds (Professional judgment and expertise and review of project plans).
2. 2020 General Plan, City of San José, 1994.
3. Santa Clara County Important Farmlands Map, 2000.
4. Zoning Ordinance, City of San José, 2001.
5. Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines, 1999.
6. Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Lowney Associates, April 11, 2001.
7. Land Use Plan for Areas Surrounding Santa Clara County Airports, Airport Land Use Commission, September 1992.
8. Flood Insurance Rate Map, FEMA, 1982.
9. Single Event Noise Assessment, Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc., January 29, 2003.
10. Vibration Assessment, Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc., January 23, 2003.
11. Archaeology Literature Review and Field Study, Holman & Associates Archaeological Consultants, January 20, 2003.
12. Subsurface Archaeological Reconnaissance, Holman & Associates Archaeological Consultants, March 2003.
13. Historical Evaluation of the Alma Bowl Structure, Archaeological Resource Management, California, June 10, 2003.
14. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, RRM, August 12, 2002.
15. Maria Angeles, City of San José Public Works Department.
16. Tamien Station Area Specific Plan, City of San Jose, March 21, 1995.
17. Transportation Analysis, Fehr & Peers Transportation Consultants, June 2003.
18. Residential Design Guidelines, City of San Jose, February 25, 1997.
19. Initial Response to Development Application, City of San Jose Department of Public Works, October 1, 2002.
20. Alma Avenue Noise Study, Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc., April 26, 2001.
21. City of San Jose Memorandum, City of San Jose Fire Department, September 26, 2002.

## V. REFERENCES

---

- Airport Land Use Commission, *Land Use Plan for Areas Surrounding Santa Clara County Airports*, September 1992.
- Archaeological Resource Management, *Historical Evaluation of the Alma Bowl Structure at 355 West Alma Avenue, San Jose, California*, June 10, 2003.
- Association of Bay Area Governments, *Projections 2000, Forecasts for the San Francisco Bay Area to the Year 2020*, December 1999.
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines*, 2001
- Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc., *Single Event Noise Assessment*, January 29, 2003.
- Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc., *Ground-Borne Vibration Assessment*, January 23, 2003.
- Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc., *Alma Avenue Noise Study*, April 26, 2001.
- City of San Jose, *Residential Design Guidelines*, February 25, 1997.
- City of San José, *San José 2020 General Plan*, 1994.
- City of San Jose, *Tamien Station Area Specific Plan*, March 21, 1995.
- City of San José, *Zoning Ordinance*, 2001.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency, *Flood Insurance Rate Map, Community Panel Number 060349 0031 D*, August 2, 1982..
- Fehr & Peers Transportation Consultants, *Transportation Analysis for Tamien Place Residential Development*, June 2003.
- Holman & Associates Archaeological Consultants, *Literature Review and Field Study of the Proposed Alma Bowl/Swenson Project Area, San Jose, California*, January 20, 2003.
- Holman & Associates Archaeological Consultants, *Subsurface Archaeological Reconnaissance of the Tamien Place Project Area at 355 West Alma Avenue, San Jose, California*, March 2003.
- Illingworth and Rodkin, Inc., *Almaden Valley Community Center Noise Study*, September 19, 2002.
- Lowney Associates, *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation*, April 11, 2001.
- RRM, *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment*, August 12, 2002.
- San Jose Water Company, *James R. Bariteau, Business Development Representative*, Letter Dated November 13, 2002.
- USDA-Soil Conservation Service, *Santa Clara County Important Farmland Map*, 2000.

## **VI. AUTHORS AND CONSULTANTS**

---

**Authors:**       **City of San José**  
Stephen Haase, Director  
Ron Eddow, Senior Planner  
Anastazia Aziz, Planner II

**Consultants:**   **David J. Powers & Associates**  
Michelle Yesney, Principal  
Demetri Loukas, Project Manager  
David North, Researcher  
Stephanie Grotton, Graphic Artist

**Fehr and Peers Associates, Inc.**  
Jason Nesdahl, Traffic Engineer

**Charles Salter and Associates, Inc.**  
Phil Sanders, Principal

**Holman and Associates, Inc.**  
Miley Holman, Archaeologist  
Matthew Clark, Archaeologist

**Archaeological Resource Management**  
Robert Cartier, Principal Investigator

**Lowney Associates**  
Richard Woodward, Senior Project Engineer

**RRM, Inc.**  
Mark Sullivan, Project Engineer